UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + +

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

+ + +

PUBLIC HEARING

ON

BROADCAST LOCALISM

+ + +

WEDNESDAY,

JULY 21, 2004

+ + +

THIRD FLOOR
STEINBECK FORUM
ONE PORTOLA PLAZA
MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

+ + +

PRESENT:

KATHLEEN ABERNATHY, FCC Commissioner

MICHAEL COPPS, FCC Commissioner

JONATHAN ADELSTEIN, FCC Commissioner

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

CONTENTS

							PAGE
Opening Remarks:							
Commissioner Abernathy							3
Commissioner Copps							. 11
Commissioner Adelstein							. 21
Welcome by Mayor Albert				-			. 32
Presentation by Alex Zerago							. 37
Presentation by Blanca Zarazua							
Presentation by Eduardo Dominguez .							
Presentation by Joseph W. Heston .							
Presentation by Joseph Salzman							
Presentation by Sean McLaughlin							
Presentation of Chuck Tweedle							
Presentation of Harry J. Pappas							
Presentation of John Connolly							
Presentation of Kathy Baker							
Presentation of Davy D							
Presentation of Delia Saldivar							
Presentation of Harry B. Robins							
Presentation of Warren Trumbly							
Transfer of Marian Transfer.	•	-	•	-	Ī	•	
Open Microphone						_	.146
-F	•	•	•	٠	٠	٠	
Closing Remarks							.292

23

24

25

26

PROCEEDINGS

COMMISSIONER ABERNATHY: Wow! I love this gavel.

(Laughter from audience)

Good evening ladies and gentlemen. And the public hearing of the Federal welcome to Communications Commission on localism and broadcasting. We're so very, very pleased to be here; gracious hospitality of everyone here. My name is Kathleen Abernathy, and I serve as a commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission and I am distinguished colleagues, joined by mу two Commissioner Michael Copps and Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein. And I am also joined by Ms. Belva Davis. She is a long time Bay Area television personality (Applause.)

COMMISSIONER ABERNATHY: and current host of "This Week in Northern California" on KQED-TV. Ms. Davis has graciously agreed to moderate the open microphone segment of our program tonight. So I want to thank her for being willing to do that.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER ABERNATHY: We are also very pleased to have with us tonight the Honorable

Daniel Albert, Mayor of the city of Monterey, who will present welcoming remarks in just a few moments.

I'm going to read a long list of dignitaries and then I think we should give them all a round of applause. We are also pleased to be joined this evening by the Honorable Ana Caballero, Mayor of the City of Salinas; the Honorable Jerry Smith, Mayor of the City of Seaside; Alex Zerago, who will present remarks on behalf of Congressman Sam Farr; Mike Canolakis, Sheriff-Monterey County; Fred Cohn, Deputy City Manager, City of Monterey; and Joy Messenger, Center for Missing and Exploited Children. And if we could welcome all these people here tonight.

(Applause.)

And finally, last but not least, we are particularly indebted to the City of Monterey, the Mayor and Mr. Cohn for their warm welcome and kind assistance in making this hearing possible. If we didn't have their help and their commitment, we wouldn't have been able to do this. So thank you very much and to all the citizens in Monterey.

(Applause.)

As I think many of you probably know, last August FCC Chairman Michael Powell created an initiative on broadcasting and localism to examine

how well radio and television stations are serving their communities of license.

(Interruptions from audience.)

(Speaking with an audience member.)
Well he's not here, he's not here. But we are here!

Now, I was going to save this part of my speech for later. But, I guess I will start it now. I think a critical part of what defines us as Americans is our ability to respect and defend the right of free speech even when people say things that we may ultimately disagree with and I have been concerned and I've seen this happen more in politics lately that when someone says something that we disagree with, we vilify them or we denigrate them and that's not what our country is about. Other countries do that. I think our country has always been strong because we welcome divergent opinions and so, but . . .

(Interruption from audience.)

Maybe I am wrong. I would hope I'm not. I think it's fair and right that people get to speak their peace uninterrupted.

(Applause.)

So that's all I ask. I want to hear from everyone. I don't think anybody has a monopoly on the truth and I want to be able to learn from everyone and so that means we would have to be able

to hear everyone. So with that, what I wanted to talk about generally is that we want to look at how radio and television stations are serving their communities of license. I think we're all, most of us here are parents, we've got kids. We know what a significant impact television and radio have on our everyday lives, on our children, on our culture. And it's very, very important that at the FCC we take our oversight role very seriously. So we've had a number of hearings. The first was in Charlotte last October. Our second was in San Antonio in Texas and our third in Rapid City, South Dakota in May. And tonight we are holding our fourth hearing here in California and we expect to hold two more hearings in the upcoming months.

So what do we mean by localism and why does the FCC care about it? In the broadest sense localism refers to the responsiveness of a broadcast station to the needs and interests of its community of license. So promoting localism is one of the principle reasons the FCC regulates broadcast television and radio and when we give an entity a license, in return, the licensee promises to serve the public through its use of the license and a key part of that public interest is that the broadcaster air programming that is responsive to the community of license and this public interest obligation

applies uniquely to broadcasters and it really distinguishes them from cable and satellite channels because if you think about cable and satellite, they're doing nationwide programming, they're not looking at the particular needs of the community.

So we are here tonight because we need to further explore whether we as government regulators, are we doing all that we can to ensure stations serve their listeners and their viewers? And I know it's a relatively simple thing to say, government should be doing more. But at the same time it ducks the hard questions -- more what? I want to hear about more oversight, more specific kinds of reports. We need to move beyond just simple statements to specific proposals. And that's why I am so pleased to be with you here tonight and listen and learn. I suspect that everyone who is taking time out of their personal lives to be here really cares about their local community and wants to understand what it means for local better broadcaster to serve the public interest.

Now, I have heard some concerns that some broadcasters have abandoned their public interest obligations. They're only interested in earnings. I'm shocked. But, I have heard that and others have said that they are very uncomfortable with some of the broadcast content. While you have

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

another group that says they're very concerned about the kinds of content, but they're concerned about intrusion government on what is said on television and the radio, and at the same time I've heard from some charitable organizations that survive thrive thanks sponsorships to from local broadcasters. So, we're receiving all of these messages, and we need to know more.

So tonight we want to determine all over again the level and the character of local broadcast service that's being provided today and to consider what behavioral rules and policies the Commission might adopt or what legislative changes, if it comes to that, that we would need to recommend to Congress to promote and improve the local service of broadcasters.

And I think the one constant in all of this is the obligation of broadcasters to serve their local community. So these hearings are an on-the-ground inspection of how the broadcast system is working for local communities, and we have three main objectives. First, we want to hear directly from all of you. We want to hear how you think local broadcasters are doing, what you like, what you dislike, what you think should be done differently.

Second, we want to hear from the broadcasters about their localism efforts. I know

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

many broadcasters are proud of the work for their local community, and we need to hear from them and hear what they've been doing to really address local community concerns.

And, third, we want to make sure that all of you know how to participate at the FCC when a local station's license is up for renewal because we need to hear about what's going on before we make certain determinations.

So, I see these hearings as an opportunity to bring these license renewals to life. I think it's one thing for us to sit in Washington and read pieces of paper. But coming here is very important and coming to the other hearings, it's very important for us to really learn about what's going on, and we want to ensure that you know how to participate in the government review of these license renewals.

So, the FCC staff has prepared a short book, really a primer on how to participate in the license renewal process, and it is available in the public packets that you got tonight, but it's also located on our website, www.fcc.gov/localism.

And then, finally, I want to touch on a recent court decision that overturned the FCC's media ownership rules. When that decision was adopted -

NEAL R. GROSS

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER ABERNATHY: I'll send your warmest personal regards to the court.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER ABERNATHY: But to go back to that decision, when that decision was adopted, I believed that we were faithfully following directions given to us by Congress and a prior court.

But now a different court has sent the rules back to us, and it has given us new instructions, and so that means at some point we will be seeking further comment on our ownership rule, and we will also want to hear from the public, from all of you, about your concerns and experiences when it comes to those issues, the media ownership issues.

And so while tonight's hearing generally focuses on what we can do to ensure that all licensees, whether they're small, large, or in between, so that we can assure that all of them are serving the local community, we will also listen, of course, to what you might have to say about ownership limits.

So I want to thank the panelists for preparing testimony and joining us tonight. The participation of the community and the local broadcasters is critical if these hearings are to be meaningful, and I want to extend a warm welcome and

the Commission's thanks to the citizens of Monterey
County and other areas who are here in attendance, as
well as anyone who's watching on TV or listening via
radio or on the FCC's audio Webcast. We are very
much looking forward to tonight's discussion.

And now I would like to acknowledge

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And now I would like to acknowledge Commissioner Copps for an opening statement, and after that Commissioner Adelstein.

COMMISSIONER COPPS: Thank you. Thank you all for coming, and thank you to this community for the warm hospitality you have already shown us. Tonight we continue a truly remarkable grassroots dialogue about the future of America's media. Over the past year we have seen a cascading national concern over what many Americans, me included, see as deeply troubling trends in the media. Citizens from all over this country have come together to express their concern, even their alarm. The discussion focuses once again on the decision by the FCC to relax the media consolidation rules with people asking how many or, maybe better, how few companies should be allowed to control our media.

For what purposes are stations granted licenses and how does the public interest fare in a consolidated environment?

Concerned parents and creative artists, religious leaders, civil rights activists, labor organizations, young people, old people, independent broadcasters and many, many others came together, worked together and made a difference together.

Their representatives in Congress answered the call. The United States Senate has voted twice now to overturn the FCC decision on ownership caps in its entirety, and over 200 members of the House of Representatives have asked the House leadership for permission to vote on the same resolution of disapproval. So far they have been denied that vote. Wouldn't it be nice if the members of the House of Representatives had a right to vote on this issue?

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER COPPS: The court responded,
too. Just last month, as Commissioner Abernathy
pointed out, the Third Circuit ruled that the FCC's
media concentration plan was legally, and
procedurally, and deeply flawed.

So we have now heard from the court. We've heard from the Congress. We've heard from the

American people that the FCC got it wrong when it tried to unleash even more consolidation. It should be clear that we need to reassess our approach and start protecting the people's interest in the people's airwaves.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER COPPS: But let me point out

COMMISSIONER COPPS: But let me point out that it is no slam dunk that this is going to happen because, while it's really good news that the court sent those rules back to the Commission, they sent it back to the very same Commission that gave you those rules in the first place.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER COPPS: So, an entirely plausible outcome of all of this could be ruled every bit as bad as the ones sent back to us, and throw in the fact that big media will be right there lobbying for everything they're worth -- and that's a bunch -- and I think you can see that the battle ahead of us is going to be long and hard.

Let's begin at the beginning tonight reminding ourselves that it's all of us who own the

airwaves, and that corporations are given the privilege of using this public asset and even to profit from its use in exchange from their commitment to serve the public interest.

Broadcasters have been given very special privileges, but they have very special responsibilities to serve their local communities. This is a special interest in serving the public interest, it's supposed to be its loadstar each day, every day, every hour.

I'm pleased that tonight we will hear from some local broadcasters with roots in their communities. We need to recognize and reaffirm the proud heritage of local broadcasters, many of whom still are committed to serving their communities well.

My concern is that the increasing media concentration out there threatens the very survival of these local broadcasters. During the hearings on media ownership that my colleague, Commissioner Adelstein and I have held across this country, we have heard time and again from local broadcasters what a direct and detrimental impact consolidation has

NEAL R. GROSS

brought upon them.

These days station owners are less and less captains of their own fate and more and more captives of unforgiving Wall Street and Madison Avenue financial expectations.

Some tell us the answer is to rely more on the marketplace forces as a guarantor of the public interest. These people trust that the public interest will somehow magically trump the urge to build power and profit, and that localism will, thereby somehow survive and thrive. I don't think we can afford to rely on any kind of magic here, the marketplace or any other kind of magic, and the people who bring us reality TV --

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER COPPS: -- the people who bring us reality TV shouldn't expect us to be so naive. In fact, we need to explain to them that the ultimate reality show is not how many bugs someone can eat on a deserted island. The ultimate reality show is this fight on media democracy and over the future of the public airwaves.

1.0

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER COPPS: Since the 1980s, fundamental protections of the public interest have been tossed overboard. Requirements like broadcasters having to meet with members of the community to determine the needs and interests of local citizens or teeing up controversial issues and antagonistic points of view for listeners and viewers, for providing viewpoint and program diversity, to name just a few of the obligations that once we had and we have no more.

In addition, we've pared back the license renewal process from one wherein the Commission used to look every three years at how stations were serving the public, with a very explicit list of things that stations were supposed to do, to a process now where once every eight years basically the broadcaster sends in a postcard, and it's a form or two more than that, but it's not called "postcard renewal" for nothing, and it's pretty much a slam dunk that the license will be renewed. That is not what public interest protections are all about.

It's so ludicrous as to be almost funny,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

but this erosion of public interest protection comes at high and dangerous cost to the American people. Some call my concern excessive, but I believe in my bones that few priorities our country confronts have such long-term importance to our democracy as how America communicates and converses with itself and how this process has been allowed to deteriorate in recent years.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER COPPS: So we come to Monterey to talk directly with members of this community and this region and to tap your local expertise to get a look, both broad and deep, at what is going on here.

Are stations adding to the civic dialogue? In this election year, are they covering the important issues that confront you or are they just focusing on the polls and handicapping the horse race? Are they covering the local issues in local campaigns? Are they encouraging local talent, local creativity, local musicians? Are they reaching out to minority groups within the community?

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Important questions and all questions the Commission refused to tackle before we voted on media consolidation, but now good fortune in the form of the court has smiled a little bit upon us and we can hopefully use the record we compile tonight as we consider the rules that have been sent back to us.

I also want to use the record we compile tonight in this license renewal process that I mentioned a moment ago. Every license in the country, television and radio, will be renewed over the course of the next few years. We need to make that a serious process once again, and we need to rely on you to make that happen.

And as Commissioner Abernathy says, there are various ways you can do this. You can file a formal objection. I don't recommend that to anybody but the really stout of heart. It's expensive and time consuming, but you can also file an informal complaint at the Commission and we are obligated to look at that informal complaint.

This is the fourth of our localism hearings. We have already heard from the good people

of the Carolinas and Texas and the Dakotas about the importance they attach to their local media. Once in a while we get a little sidetracked on this score, however, and I want to point this out tonight.

Some of our broadcaster panelists and commenters seem to confuse sometimes such things as conducting blood drives and fundraising for charities of their public interest sum total with the Now, please do not get me wrong responsibilities. these fundraising activities here because tremendously commendable activities. I welcome them. I salute them, and this is as American as apple pie for corporations in every line of business participate in that kind of community self-help, and we should all be proud of it and all applaud it.

But that is only part of a broadcaster's responsibility to the community, and the question on the table tonight is how well this very special industry is serving its much broader obligations to use the airwaves to benefit all of us.

So I hope that our panelists and commenters tonight will resist the temptation just to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

catalogue all of these non-broadcast activities and focus instead on the even more important problems that we've identified.

Again, let me thank our panelists, my two colleagues here with me tonight, and most of all, you in the audience who gave up an evening when you could be doing lots of other things to be here with us tonight.

In the end this really all comes down to you. It doesn't come down to the courts or the Congress. It comes down to the American people, and I think what I see going around this country and everywhere we go on a night like this you'll see four or five, 600 people turn out; I think the people of the United States want to wrap their arms around this issue of how many or how few companies are going to control our media future and settle it.

And I think if we all pull together, at the other side of this process that we're involved in now, and I hope it won't take months and months and months; I think we need to do this relatively quickly in the next few months, and if we do it right, we will

NEAL R. GROSS

1	end up with airwaves of, by and for the American
2	people. Thank you very much.
3	(Applause.)
4	COMMISSIONER ABERNATHY: Thank you very
5	much, Commissioner Copps, and I think everyone knows
6	his commitment to this issue. So thank you again.
7	And now I'd like to introduce Commissioner
8	Jonathan Adelstein for his opening remarks.
9	COMMISSIONER ADELSTEIN: Thank you,
10	Commissioner Abernathy.
11	(Applause.)
12	COMMISSIONER ADELSTEIN: Thank you.
13	Well, it's a real breath of fresh air to
14	get out of Washington, D.C. Let me tell you.
15	(Laughter.)
16	COMMISSIONER ADELSTEIN: It's a bit of a
17	swamp there in more ways than one, and to get that
18	fresh ocean breeze coming when I went to Monterey was
19	just so refreshing, and it always is refreshing to
20	get outside of the Beltway and hear from the wisdom of
21	the American people because by all accounts, I think
22	there is a lot more out there than there is inside
<u>د</u> د	
	NEAL R. GROSS

where we come from.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER ADELSTEIN: And I learn so much each time I come and listen to you. I, of course, love it out here. I spent a couple of summers right down the Pacific Coast Highway in Big Sur. It's not on my resume, but I was actually a dishwasher at Epison.

(Laughter and applause.)

COMMISSIONER ADELSTEIN: There were many days at the FCC when I wish I had just taken up residence here.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER ADELSTEIN: Well, the focus today is on how well broadcasters are serving their local communities as we've heard, but tonight comes in the middle of this larger struggle we've talked about the overall ownership of the public's airwaves. It's a fight for media democracy, and it's a struggle we simply can't afford to lose.

Last year I came out here to San Francisco for an unofficial hearing without all of the great

staff assistance and everything, but we did it on a shoestring at City Hall in San Francisco, and we had hundreds of people stand in line for hours to get in there. It was a reflection even before the ownership decision of the deep concern in this part of the country about the state of the airwaves.

Everywhere we went Commissioner Copps and I heard from people a groundswell of concern about letting giant media companies grow even bigger. A lot of citizens spoke about how they think consolidation homogenizes programming, cuts independent and minority voices, and guts the coverage of local issues in local communities.

So I came back to D.C. from these hearings, including the one in San Francisco, and I warned my colleagues that people here in California weren't satisfied with their media, and they weren't interested in any more consolidation.

Well, this is, as I learned, Citizen Kane country right down the highway there, right down Highway 1, but the new rules that went through would have allowed new media moguls to rise up that make

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Citizen Kane look like an underachiever.
2	(Laughter.)
3	COMMISSIONER ADELSTEIN: But what a
4	difference a year can make. Incredible the amount of
5	education, the amount of thought and energy and
6	activism and concern and studies that went into this.
7	Now, the American people have spoken.
8	Congress and the courts have spoken, and they've all
9	condemned the FCC's wrong-headed decision. The same
LO	week just a couple of weeks ago that the Senate voted
11	99 to one to put the FCC's damaging rule changes from
12	last summer on hold, a federal court as we have heard
13	rendered a decisive verdict against more media
14	consolidation. That was a huge victory for the
15	American people.
16	That was probably the biggest victory in
17	the history of the media democracy movement, and it
18	was a tribute to everyone who spoke up, including many
19	people in this room. Congratulations to all of you.
20	(Applause.)
21	COMMISSIONER ADELSTEIN: The court
22	reaffirmed that the airwaves belonged to you. What

NEAL R. GROSSCOURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

you told us time and again at every hearing I heard it again and again: "the airwaves belong to us. Why can't we have more control over them? Why can't we have any say in them?"

Well, the court spoke loudly and clearly that the FCC's job is to protect you, to protect the public. It blasted the FCC for using inconsistent and incoherent reasoning that didn't reflect the real world.

Perhaps that's because the FCC didn't take the time to reach out to the public last year, as I pleaded with my colleagues to do and I know Commissioner Copps did. We only held one official hearing as a group, and we didn't put an outline of the rules out for public comment, and if we had, I think a lot of the flaws that the court found in the decision could have been addressed before we made them final, and we wouldn't have had that decision the way we did.

And we shouldn't have dismissed the views of three million people with a single passing paragraph.

NEAL R. GROSS